

4752-11.3
39
K Brush (E.) & others. A

VINDICATION

OF THE

CHRISTIAN QUAKERS,

FROM THE

*Malicious Insinuations, in a late PAMPHLET,
said to be Signed on their Behalf by D. S.*

WHEREAS there is a Scandalous and Malicious Libel, or Pamphlet, lately Published, Intituled, *An Answer to several Passages, Citations, or Charges, in a late Book of F. Bugg's, Stiled, New Rome Arraigned, &c.* and said to be given forth, and Signed in Behalf of the *Christian Quakers*, without any Name, but only the Letters, D. S. to it. We, who are of that Christian People, called *Quakers*, and have walked in Society with them for many Years, do hereby declare, That the said Pamphlet was not written by any, that had Direction or Leave from us, or any in Unity with, or owned, by us, or any Meeting of ours; but that it is a meer Trick put upon us, by some Malicious Adversary, to Misrepresent and Abuse us, under pretence of Writing on our Behalf; and that we are thereby greatly Wronged, and very injuriously Dealt with: Of which we think fit to give this Publick Notice, that none, for want of due Information, may be Misled by that Pamphlet into an ill Opinion of us. For we sincerely declare, That we do firmly believe all Things recorded in the Holy Scriptures, which we acknowledge to have been given forth by Divine Inspiration: And we do utterly deny and disown all Doctrines contrary thereunto, however Misrepresented by our Adversaries.

In witness whereof, we do for our selves, and our Friends and Brethren, in Scorn called *Quakers*, hereunto set our Names, subscribing our selves, as in Truth we are, well Wishers to all Men.

London, the 17th Day of the 7th Month, 1694.

Edward Brush,
Walter Miers,
Thomas Cox,
Charles Bathurst,
Gilbert Latey,
Thomas Lower,
William Phillips,
Thomas Mincks,

John Vaughton,
Nathanael Markes,
John Cooper,
William Bingley,
Charles Marshall,
Timothy Emerson,
William Sanders,
George Bowles,

John Feild,
Michael Russel,
John Knight,
Henry Gouldney,
John Tomkins,
Thomas Hutson,
John Evered,
Daniel Wharley,

2152-40
40
N. Friends, Sec. of

To The Respective

'MEMBERS
OF THE
HOUSE of COMMONS,
THE HUMBLE
APPLICATION
Of the PEOPLE, Commonly Called
QUAKERS.

WEE the said People, being a Member of that Body which You Represent, and concerned in Trade and Industry, and Employing many Poor in the Manufactories of this Nation; as also in Contributing to the Charge of the Government according to our Abilities; Do Desire and Humbly Crave, That our Liberties, Rights and Properties, may be Secured to us and ours; That we may no longer be Exposed to Unjust and Vexatious Suits, nor be a Prey to Ill Disposed Persons, who take Advantage against us, to Prosecute and Ruine us, meerly because in point of Tender Conscience, ~~we dare not~~ ~~Swear in any Case~~; which is in Obedience to the Command of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as we verily believe is our Duty in this Gospel-Day; but hold our selves Obligated to Declare and Testifie the Truth without Oath, in Cases wherein our Answers and Testimonies may be required.

Wherefore we Humbly Entreat Your Christian Compassion in Your Favourable Acceptance of our Petition, which is, For Leave to bring in a Bill for our Relief; and so to Consider our Suffering-Case, as if it were Your Own, and You in our stead; That we and our Posterities, may have Cause to Bless the Lord on Your Behalf.

about 1695.

see Meeting page 143

5 'AP 58

Deceit Discovered and Malice Manifested

In L. K E Y'S late Paper from READING the third of the fourth Month 1693.

By THOMAS ELWOOD.

Being lately in London, I there saw a Paper, Subscribed by B. Coal, and recommended to the Press by C. Harris, proposing Expedients for a true Reconciliation among the People of God called Quakers. At the reading whereof, considering with my self the manifold Reproaches that have been cast upon Friends in Print, by divers of that Party that have opposed Friends, whereby Friends have been publicly traduced and deamed, being represented to the World as Apostates and Innovators; Idolaters, setters up of Images and Idols, Introducers of Popery, and but one step from it, with more of like kind, in bitter Terms expressed, it seemed strange to me that the Authors of that Paper (if they were in earnest in what they proposed) should offer Expedients for a Reconciliation, before they had given Friends and the World satisfaction that they are now sensible we are not what they (or some of their Party) have misrepresented us to be; which their seeming to desire a Reconciliation with us implies, & which we may charitably hope some among them sincerely intend: for they would render themselves guilty of gross Hypocrisy indeed, in desiring to be reconciled to us, if they yet believe us to be such. It had been fit therefore that before other Expedients for Reconciliation had been offered by such who had falsely accused Friends, and exposed our holy Profession to the Contempt of the prophane, they should have acknowledged their Evil in having so done, and given Proof of their Repentance thereof, that by first clearing us from those false Accusations, they might have declared us to be such, as men pretending to Truth and Godliness, might fairly be reconciled to; and might thereby have given us some ground to hope, that as the sincerity of their Repentance should manifest itself, by an honest and hearty Confessing and forsaking their former Works of Envy, Strife, Bitterness, Railing, False-accusing, Division and Separation, we should see them return in the Peaceable Spirit of Truth, in which we could with gladness receive them, and in which only we can be truly reconciled to them.

When I returned home, I there found a Letter directed to me from L. Key of Reading, with a Printed sheet inclosed therein, in Terms and Tendency so contrary to the before mentioned Paper signed by B. C. and C. H. (That proposing Expedients for Peace, and Reconciliation: This renewing the Difference, and stirring up Contention a fresh) that I could not but wonder at it; and the rather because I had understood that L. Key (if he himself did not bring up that Paper of B. Coals to be printed) was very active and busy in spreading it after it was Printed, which showed he was privy and consenting thereunto. Comparing the Dates of these two Papers together, I found them both dated from Reading, one of them on the 3d. the other on the 4th. of the 4th Month 1693. not one day between. And so Contrary are the Terms and tendencies of them, one to the other, that hardly any thing can be more. For in the Proposals for Reconciliation, they say, *Let all Whisperings, Backbitings, Wrath and Envy be watched against and denied.* Yet the other Paper, Signed by L. Key, is made up mostly of Back bitings, Wrath and Envy. In their Paper for Reconciliation they say, *All things relating to former Differences, let it be buried in Oblivion on all hands:* Yet in the other Paper, Signed by L. Key, the Reader is bid *See the Memorial for the present Generation, and also for that which is to come; It gives (says he) an account of the Difference that hath happened among the People called Quakers in those parts; Also see the Revival that was published from Reading in 1692. it giving an Account how the Difference was brought in there.* (This Paper which he calls the Revival, was a single Sheet Signed by L. Key himself (I. R. and C. H. Signing some part of it) in which about half a Score of their Contentious, and abusive Pamphlets are named, and recommended to the Readers view.) Thus while in one Paper Reconciliation is proposed, and that not only former Differences, but all things relating thereto, should be buried in Oblivion (that is, be utterly forgotten, never to be mentioned or remembered any more:) in the other Paper (lest the Difference should dye, or be forgotten) the Titles of those former Printed Papers (wherein, he says, an Account is given of the Difference, and how it was brought in here and there) are reprinted, and the Reader referred a fresh to them, for further information in the Difference; and particularly to that paper of J. Raunce, and C. Harris, which appears by its Title to be intended for a lasting Monument of the Difference, to continue it in Remembrance, that it might not be forgotten either in this Age or the next, and therefore was called *a Memorial for the present Generation, and also for that which is to come.* Was this the way to bury the Difference in Oblivion? Or was this plain and honest dealing in L. Key, to reprint the Titles of those Papers, which he himself says give Account of the difference, and recommend them anew to his Reader at the same time that he is spreading the Expedient for Reconciliation, in which all things relating to former Differences are proposed to be buried in Oblivion on all hands? I would not charge this double-Dealing upon the whole Party nor upon any of that Party that are not guilty thereof; but upon such only as take it upon themselves by spreading or owning both those Papers, as some I know have done, particularly J. Raunce, who hath sent them abroad together, thereby concerning himself alike in the one as in the other. But I recommend it to the Consideration of all of that Party, who would be accounted sincere and honest, how little it makes for their Reputation to hold Communion with such, and how much it concerns them to clear themselves from owning L. Key, and those that abet him, herein, who by this deceitful Dealing have manifested themselves to be like those Workers of Iniquity, whom the Psalmist mentions, (Psalm. 28. 3.) *which speak peace to their Neighbours but mischief is in their Hearts.* Having premised this, I shall now take notice of some particular passages in L. Key's Paper.

First, I observe the Account I formerly gave of that Scandalous Marriage (of the Woman that lay with her Father) promoted and highly contended for by J. R. and C. H. and carried on against the mind of Friends, hath stuck so fast on them ever since, that they have not been able to clear themselves of it, though they have laboured at it with all their might, and used many tricks to do it. First they gave out that I writ the Certificate, insinuating thereby that I owned that Marriage as well as they. But I having cleared that point in my Answer to L. Key's former Paper, and thereby laid their Deceit more open, their Agent L. Key in his last Sheet, hath published a Paper Subscribed by the Woman her self, which he introduces thus, viz. *[And a Paper is made publick, that was left by the Woman that he hath so much reviled, and is not in being to Answer for her self.]* Who, thus should read these Words, and knew not the Buliness before hand, but would conclude the Woman at the time of her death, had left this Paper behind her to clear her self of that Report? Whereas in plain Truth, the Paper there mentioned, was by the Woman her self, delivered to the Monthly Meeting (before she Married) under pretence (not of Clearing, but) of Condemning her self for what she had done; and is the very same Paper I formerly mentioned in my Book called *The Account from Wickham examined*, &c. p. 4. The Original of which Paper as delivered by the Woman, I have in my keeping, written (if I do not mistake the Hand) in C. Harris his own hand Writing, by whom it was then understood to be drawn up for her, and was so favourably Worded, that it seemed rather to palliate and excuse her Offence, than condemn it. Yet that Paper, as L. Key hath now Printed it (though C. H. did what he could to mince the Matter in favour of that bad Woman) plainly proves what I have written of her, acknowledging that it was reported she did *lodge* with (which is a fuller Expression than to lye with, implying a continued use or course of lyeing with) her Father, which, as to Matter of Fact, she doth not deny, but alledges it was with no evil intent, &c. And though her Advocate C. H. in drawing up that Paper for her, to extenuate her Fault, did put in the Word *[Sometimes]* and *[in the time of his aged weakness, and when he was sick unto death]* yet it is known the Report was not so: but her lyeing with her Father was spoken of by her Neighbours of the world with Abhorrence, and charged upon her as a Scandal to Religion. And those Grave Women Friends whom at the Request of the Mens Meeting, the Womens Meeting sent to Examine her, and inquire into that Buliness, made report to the mens Meeting, in as modest terms as they could, that they found she had behaved her self very immodestly in her Carriage towards her Father. So that the more these men stir in this foul Matter, the worse they make both it and themselves to smell.

Another Shift they have invented to excuse their altering the Certificate, and bringing that Marriage among Friends, is, That it was then a time of Persecution, and the People that owned the House were not willing a Meeting should be there. This L. Key says he has been told, & this J. Raunce hath written to me and others: But this (so far as I can find) is another deceitful Artifice of theirs, quite void of Truth. For I have not only recollected my own Memory, and inquired of other Friends, but searched also the general Record of the Sufferings of Friends in this County, & do not find there was any suffering upon Friends in these Parts, for Meetings either then, or a considerable time before or after. But since they have affirmed it was a time of Persecution, let them name, if they can

any one Friend that suffered about that time, on the account of Meeting; in this Country. If they do not, it may be concluded they cannot; and that this pretence (of its being then a time of Persecution) is but an invented falsehood, to excuse their dirty Doings.

He complains that *Nothing will serve me but an Answer in Print.* He mistakes, if he and they that set him on work, had honestly enough to acknowledge their faults, that would serve me as well, and themselves, better then any answer he or they could make. I say [they that set him on work] because I look on him but as a *Key*, and others at Wickham to be the *hands* that turn him forward or backward, at their pleasures, who being conscious to themselves of the badness of their Cause, are not willing to appear publicly in it themselves, and therefore have set this *Tool* to Work, who can blunder on at any rate, as little regarding to write Truth, as knowing how to write common Sense. In which respect I think it, I confess an Unhappyness to me, to have to do with such an one: For one had better deal with ten wise men, than one that thinks himself so, and is nothing less.

They are angry that, while their abusive and slanderous Papers will not go off, unless they be given away, my just Defences are Printed and sold without Charge to me. This made J. R. and C. H. formerly inquire, whether they were not paid for out of the publick Stock; and this makes L. Key now say of me, *If he did pay for what he doth out of his own Pocket, I am ready to think we should not hear so often from him.* This is neither Christian nor Manly; but silly and Cowardly: for since they hear no often from me than they assault Truth, Friends and me (what I have written to them being only Defensive) so far as I remember) it seems they would be glad that I were disabled from answering them, that so they might at pleasure rail, revile, abuse, reproach, defame, bely, slander Truth, Friends and me, in Print, and hope to be secure from being Answered, at least by me. How much this makes for their Credit, let them consider, and the Reader Judge. Yet let them not deceive themselves herein, but know assuredly, that were I (as they wish) incapable of Answering them, through inability to pay for Printing, yet should they not thereby escape unreprieved.

In my last, I charged L. Key with having changed the express and plain Words of my Book, and thereby falsified the intent and meaning of them. As that was too manifest to be denied, so he had not honesty enough to confess his fault, nor ingenuity enough to be ashamed of it. But in his last paper, not attempting to clear himself, nor answer my Charge, but thinking to wind himself off by a Wile, he has run himself into a most foolish Absurdity. He says, *The Certificate (of that Marriage before mentioned bears date the 12th. of the 1st. Month, in the year 1677. And a few lines after, says, The old man that set up the Womens Meeting (so scornfully and contemptibly doth he think and write of that honourable Servant of God G. F.) did come to Reading to endeavour it in the 6th. Month in the year 1681.* Then he adds, *Observe, this was above four years before that Marriage that T. E. hath made all this Clamour about.* Is not this a rare Accomptant, who hath made the year 81. to be 4. years before the year 77? This is so obvious an Error, that as none but such a Fumbler would have made it, so had he not been blind he might have seen and corrected it. But he, being blinded with envy, and thinking to twist himself out of the Toyl he had run himself into before, plunged on Headlong into this Brake, without fear or wit, Consideration or common Sense. This one would think were enough to have drawn blushes into the Cheeks of any one, that deserved the name of Man. But so stupid was he, that, thinking he had gained some Advantage by the Project, he falls to improving it, saying of me thus *[so he was right in saying, it was before any Marriage had gone to the Womens Meetings.]* This he infers from his notable Discovery, that 81. was 4. years before 77. but (not to let his folly excuse his falsehood) if I was right in saying as I did, let him and all that abet him, consider how wrong he was in altering those Words of mine, and instead thereof, affirming I said, *It was before the Womens Meetings were set up.* A sort of Forgery, the guilt whereof I still charge upon him.

Notwithstanding this ridiculous blunder that he has made, so void of sense he is, that, as if he had exposed some weakness on my part, he scornfully reflects this sentence on me, *Great men are not always wise.* Not understanding the Proverb that says (*Nemo mortalium omnibus bonis sapit*) No man is always wise. But alas! there is a sort of Great men that are never wise (never were, nor ever are like to be) and they that know L. Key, know he is none of the least men, either in Person or Conscience: He reflects on the Approvers of my Work: but I think the Approvers of his will get little Credit by it, unless he mend his hand at it. And indeed it is an Argument of judicial blindness, and great Infatuation of mind, in him and them that promote his Paper, that they should spread it about as they do, without seeing the shameful blunder he has made in it. He adds another Text out of Job, which begins thus, *Upright men shall be furnished at this, and ends thus, I cannot find one wise man among you.* Job. 17. 8, 10. But surely if he and his Approvers, do but once as clearly prove, as he has confidently asserted, that 81. was 4. years before 77 all men that hear it, will be astonished at that, and I shall be forced to acknowledge, there are many wise men among them such as they be.

Three great Instances he has already given; one of his Dishonesty, in altering my Words; another of his Hypocrisy, in spreading a Paper of Proposals for Reconciliation and Peace, and at the same time printing another Paper to renew Contention and War; A third, of his Folly in computing the times. Now, to manifest that his Malice is equal to the rest, he here repeats his former Slander about my having suffered my Father to want. Which having in his former Sheet delivered upon an *[it hath been said]* I returned upon himself, shewing how basely I had been abused in that case by C. Harris, and another before, who when publicly called to Account for it, flunk back and durst not undertake to make good their Charge. Whereupon I laid it upon L. Key to name whom he had heard say it, to free himself from being reputed the Author, as well as Publisher of that envious slander. Which as it behoved him to have done, so I conclude he would have done it, had he been able to have named any. But though he maliciously renews his slander, yet he names no Author of it; but says, *it hath been said by those that knew it, &c.* So that his Proof that it hath been so said, is saying again, that it hath been so said, which depends only on his credit, who in this case, deserves none.

He cavils also at my Fathers being buried in that part of the ground, where (he says) they did use to bury Strangers and Vagabonds. Had not he and his employers, been Strangers to Christianity and Civility, they might have employed themselves better than to ride so many miles as some of them have done (perhaps 20. or more) to see if they could pick up a Stone at my Fathers Grave to throw at me. I confess I am not so well acquainted with the Grave-Yard, as to understand the difference of Places in it, or whether some parts of it be more consecrated than others: Yet methinks, had he and his Informers, remembered their former Principles they should not have quarrelled with me for that. However, the Place for the Grave was not of my appointing: for, being prevented from being at the Burial, by a Message my Father received in his Sickness, that my Sister lay then sick in London, near unto death, after I had waited upon my Father until he had finished his life, and given direction for his Interment, I hastened up to my Sister at London, as thinking I might be more serviceable to the Living, than to the Dead, and knew not in what part of the Ground the Grave was made, till at my return from London, I went thither to discharge the Charge of his Sickness and Funeral. This some of these men knew long since, which (had they been men of common Ingenuity) might have prevented, as it may now Answer that other idle cavil about my not being present when my Fathers was laid in the Ground.

To conclude, as I neither need nor desire favour, nor expect Justice from men so filled with Envy, and devoted to Mischief: So I am glad that after all the pains they have taken, their running and riding, traversing the Countries, from Wickham, Reading, and other parts, viewing the place, visiting my Fathers Grave, (above seven years after his death) not in love to him, but hatred to me (even J. R. himself, going to the Grave, who is old enough, one would think, to have been wiser, and has known that which would have made him better) examining Persons, sifting matters, asking many cunning and tempting Questions of the people of the World, to draw forth if they could, some matter of complaint against me, yea provoking (not to say suborning) some to pretend they had shewed kindness to my Father, that they might thereby either oblige me to reward such, (for nothing) or upbraid me with ungratitude, if I did not (while I not suspecting such unonly baseness among them so innocently still) they have not been able to pick or raise up any thing, that might answer their Pains, or gratify their envy, but instead of defaming me (which they designed) they have sufficiently defamed themselves, in discovering so ill a mind. To whom yet, for a l their evil Will, and evil Acting towards me, I wish nothing but Good. And though I cannot say of some of them (as our Lord said of others of old) *Father forgive them, they know not what they do*, being persuaded that most of them that have a hand in this Work do sin against knowledge, as knowing they do evil: yet, in pity to them, I can, and do sincerely say, *Father, if their day be not quite over, give them Repentance, and forgive them.*

Hunger-Hill, 4th. of 6th. Month. 1693. T. E.

44

3 AP 58



K
Thomas Ellwood's Answer to so much of Leonard Key's late Printed Sheet of Paper, as relates to him.

Such is the restless Nature of ENVY, that it will not suffer those, in whose Breasts it lodgeth, to be quiet; but filling them with a fretting Discontent, is continually stirring them up to Strife and Contention: Whereby they become like those whom the Prophet of old compared to the troubled Sea, when it cannot rest, whose Waves cast up mire and dirt, Isa. 57. 20. Thus some ungodly men now (like those whom Jude described of old) having, in their sensual minds, separated themselves from the People of God, and become like raging Waves of the Sea, have fomented their own shame in many printed Books and Papers, which of late years they have sent abroad: And lest those Books and Papers should not have fallen into every hand, or the matter contained in them should have fallen or slipped out of any mind or memory, a restless Agent of that Party hath lately published a Sheet of Paper to revive them, the Title whereof is, *Something of a Revival of what hath been made publick, &c.* Wherein many of their reviling and abusive Pamphlets are named, and recommended afresh to the Readers view. So industriously careful they are to blow the Coals, to keep the Fire flaming; so fearful lest Contention and Strife (the food and life of that Spirit which they are joyned to and guided by) should dy, decay or flag. By which all, that will, may see how deceitful they are, who (to gain upon the Simple) pretend they are for Peace, and that Contention might cease and dy; yet left it should, are ever and anon sending forth some envious Book, or silly sheet, to pick new Quarrels, or revive the old. But, as it was said of the foolish Woman, that she pulleth down her house with her hands, Prov. 14. 1. So it is observable of this man, and of the rest of that Party, that have appeared in Print, that in all their undertakings of this kind, they have either themselves discovered their own Deceit and Wickedness, or given others occasion to do it, and have thereby still pulled down some Peace or other of their own confused Building. Which Infatuation of mind may well be looked upon as a divine Judgment upon them. Now although the greatest part of that Paper, lately published by L. Key, is about the shutting up the Meeting House Doors at Reading, and turning Friends out of their Right and Property (which having been already stated and debated in print, may probably be the reason why the Friends of Reading, named therein, have not thought fit to take notice of it: Yet, in as much as in that Paper my name is used, and mention made of a Certificate made by me, with an Insinuation as if I had declined a publick Meeting with J. R. and C. H. (which, with some other Passages, are so darkly hinted in the said Paper, that they cannot be thereby understood) I think fit a little to open those Passages, that the Reader may be enabled to see, and judge where the Truth of the matter lies.

In the Title of L. Key's sheet, he saith, *And something is said to Thomas Ellwood's Book.* But certainly that *Something* is so near *Nothing*, that were it not for the clearing of other Passages, and partly also to prevent his being *wife in his own conceits*, I should not have thought it worth my while to have said any thing to it at all. He begins with me in his third Paragraph, where he bids his Reader see the Account from Wickham, and see also what was said to it, by that quibbling man Thomas Ellwood: For (says he) it doth appear he was the man, that writ the Certificate, concerning that Marriage he doth make such a Clamour about: Which he saith, in page the 5th was before the Womens Meetings were set up. That the Reader may understand the matter thus darkly laid down, I think it needful to open it a little. The Account from Wickham, which he here mentions, was part of the Title of a Printed Sheet of Paper, published in the year 1690, and subscribed in divers places with the Letters J. R. and C. H. (though C. H. hath since declared that it was printed without his consent or knowledge.) To that I writ an Answer, the Title whereof was, *The Account from Wickham (lately published by John Rounce and Charles Harris) examined and found false, &c.* In that Answer of mine, to manifest their Deceit (and thereby prevent others from being deceived by them) who in their printed Paper said, *We have only stood for our own and others Liberty in Christ, &c.* I was necessarily led to shew, that the Liberty they had stood for was not a Liberty in Christ, but a Liberty out of Christ, out of Truth, a fleshly Liberty, a corrupt Liberty, and a particular Liberty to mix in Marriages with such as were not of us, and those also such as were not of them, but of a particular Instance of the same, which was a Couple the Man was not reputed to be married to, by her Neighbours, with having lain with her own Father, to the great Scandal of Religion. And having shewed how much that Marriage was against the mind and life of the Meeting, and what a long Contest it occasioned therein, I set forth there also how, at length, they overbore and prevailed upon the Meeting to permit it to pass, which yet was not yielded unto without this particular Caution, that they should not take each other in any publick Meeting of Friends, but amongst their own Relations that Friends might stand clear of them afterwards. To which though J. R. and themselves agreed, yet were they afterwards brought to a publick monthly Meeting of Worship, where they took each other in Marriage amongst Friends, and as Friends, J. R. being there to preach on that occasion. And that, when some Friends, being grieved and offended thereat, arose and departed in Testimony against it, J. R. in reflection upon them and to abet the Marriage, publickly said, *Let him that is without Sin cast the first Stone* (as in my said Answer to their Account is more at large declared.) This Open Discovery of their Deceit and Naughtiness (whereof not themselves only, but many others also know them to be guilty) hath so enraged them, and others of their party against me, that in many places, both of City and Country they have poured forth their Displeasure against me in floods of Reproaches, Revilings and Railing: For which the Lord give them Repentance, and forgive them. But because bare Railing at me would not excuse themselves, therefore, that they might seem to say something in their own defence, they alleadge that I, who blame them for promoting that Marriage, did myself write the Certificate for it. And by this Artifice they have amused and abused many. Now of that matter the plain and naked Truth is this; that as the terms, and (as it were) Condition, upon which the Meeting, after so long contention about it, did at length yeild to permit that Marriage to pass, was, that they should not take each other in any publick Meeting of Friends (which the Parties concerned agreed to:) so, in order to hold them there unto, I did make a Certificate for them, thereby fixing their Marriage to a certain Day and Place (of their own nomination) which was a private House of one, who was either Relation or Acquaintance to one of them, on purpose to prevent their being married at any publick Meeting, or amongst Friends. But that Certificate which I writ, and as I writ it, was not the Certificate that was signed at their Marriage; but either there was, another written by some body else, or that which I writ was altered, to accommodate it to their design, and that in those material parts of it, relating to Time and Place, for the only sake of which I writ it. So that, to justify themselves for imposing that Marriage upon Friends, they alleadge that I writ the Certificate, thereby insinuating that I owned and forwarded that Marriage as well as They: whereas the Certificate that I writ was written on purpose to prevent that which they did; and that Certificate which they used was not the same that I writ. I writ a Certificate to keep that Marriage from being brought to any publick Meeting of Friends: some of them either writ another, or altered that Certificate, to bring that Marriage to a publick Meeting of Friends, and by so doing made that Certificate their own, not mine, either in Deed or in Intention. Thus they would cover Deceit with Deceit: but their Covering is too short and to narrow, and this further Discovery of their double Deceit redounds to their further shame. But this is not all: L. Key is so eager on their behalf to fasten this upon me, that he runs himself on ground, and as they falsified the Certificate I writ, so he hath falsified the plain words in my Book: for he says that, in page 5. of my Book I say this Marriage was before the Womens Meetings were set up; which is an apparent Falshood of his, and he is therein guilty of a downright untruth. My words, in the place he quotes, are quite otherwise. I there say, *The Contest between Friends and them about this Couple, was before any Marriage had gone to the Womens Meetings:* He says, I there say the Marriage was before the Womens Meetings were set up. Had he not been in the blind Zeal, he falsly charges others with, he might have seen in the page he quotes of my Book, that the Womens Meetings were set up before that, since I there declare, that the Friends were fain to use the help of the Womens Meetings, to examine that unhandsom Carriage of the before mentioned Woman towards her Father. But Envy had blinded him, and his Master owed him this shame.

He goes on thus concerning me, viz. *The Noise he makes against Separates and Separate Meetings*

cannot be pleasant nor easy to his Friends at Reading that could have talked as much of their inward sense as he doth of his, &c. This is idle trashy stuff. How knows he, and what needs he matter, whether it be pleasant or easy to my Friends, or not? My Friends at Reading are quiet and still, a good sign of Ease and Content: but he winches, kicks and flings, by which I can tell whose Back is gauled, better than by his silly Insinuations. I would know of him when, where and to whom I have talked so much of my inward sense? Let him produce some Instance of it, if he can, or blush (if he be not past it) at his over bold Folly. He says of others, *there blind Zeal being somewhat abated, they go now at a slower rate;* but surely his blind Zeal is somewhat heightened, he runs on at so fast a rate in his ungodly Course of scoffing at inward sense. I confess I value inward sense more then to be jeered out of the esteem of it by any of his frothy flouts: And if he were a man of any good outward sense; he would not have made inward sense the subject of his sport.

He hath yet another snap at me, but snaps short, and though he shews his Teeth, he has not power to bite. His words are, *Reader, see for thy self, and take not what he saith upon trust: For it hath been said, he suffered his aged Father to want.* This speaks its self a Slander even from the very manner of his bringing it forth. *It hath been said,* By whom, hath this been said? perhaps by L. Key himself, or some others of his Party, who care not what they say, that they think might disgrace me. The like, I have heard, hath been said by Charles Harris, who (against all Rules of either Christianity, common Civility or Humanity) did publickly traduce me with it, in an open Meeting, before a great Assembly of People, and in my absence. But when, at a Meeting afterwards in the same place, appointed between Friends and him (wherein his unbridled Tongue manifested his Religion to be vain, James 1. 26. and his Heart corrupt, Mat. 12. 34. amongst other scoffing Reflections and vile Reproaches, calling J. R. Penington's eldest Son FOUL MOUTH'D BRAT) I called him to an Account for his base abuse of me with relation to my Father (as I did then also another of that Party, then present, who had back-bitten me also with the same Slander) demanding of them severally, by name, if they would undertake to make it good against me, they both flunk back, and severally answered, *No*; for they knew nothing of it (they said) but by *Hearsay*. And when I had given that Assembly an Account of my demeanour and carriage towards my Father (which I believe gave satisfaction to all there, who were not resolved against it) C. H. acknowledged that what I had said might be true for ought he knew, and said he had not mentioned my Father, if I had not blamed the Woman for lying with her Father. And when the Meeting was ended, one of that Party came to me, and said he was sorry that business of my Father was mentioned, for he was sensible I was greatly wronged therein, having made particular Inquiry about it, for his own satisfaction. Now L. Key's Paper being written (as I have ground to think) since that Meeting, he would not adventure to make it a downright Charge against me (as C. H. to his shame, had done) but brings it in with an (*It hath been said*) which is a sly way of insinuating a Slander. But seeing L. Key hath thereby manifested himself to be like those whom the Prophet of old complained of that said Report, and we will report it, Jer. 20. 10. I do again deny the Charge, and put him upon the proof thereof. And since he saith *It hath been said*, it behoves him to name whom he hath heard say it, to free himself from being the Author, as well as Publisher of this malicious Slander. He says of others, *It was their Practice to spread Lies:* But he has now proved it to be his own. And therefore I have much more reason, then he, to desire the Reader not to take what he says upon trust. For he deserves no credit, with honest and judicious Persons, in furnishing a Defamation upon no better ground than an (*It hath been said*), especially seeing I have now convicted him of falsifying the plain words of my Book. But since he, and some others of that Party (especially those at Wickham) have taken this course to defame me, let them not complain if, when occasion serves, I shoot their own Arrows back upon themselves, and let the World as publickly know what hath been said of some of them.

His saying, *If I had not assented more in my Book, than I could make out or stand by, I and those that did approve it, need not have declined a Meeting,* is but an empty Crack; for though he read a Paper at the yearly Meeting (of which he hath now printed a Copy,) wherein J. R. and C. H. said it was theirs, for it was neither written nor subscribed, with their, or either of their names, yet he was willing to have the matter brought to a publick Hearing in the Country, &c. yet neither he nor they, nor any from or for them (that ever I could hear of) did ever come again, or send, for the Meetings Answer thereunto; so little earnest were they in reality to have what they made a show to offer, viz. a Meeting. And how little reason the Meeting, or I, had to take notice of that Paper may appear by this, that whereas in that Paper (which has as little sense as Truth in it) they complain that I have wronged and abused them and myself, and all those that do adhere to me, by publishing Lies against them, the matter they assign for proof thereof is, that in my Examination of their Paper, I say I have found the Account from Wickham false, but have not proved it so. Was not this a sufficiently idle pretence for a publick Hearing in the Country, when as both their Paper and my Answer thereto being in print, both City and Country (and all Countries where they were spread) were capable, by comparing the one with the other, to judge whether I had proved their Account false, or no? They pretended they were willing to have a publick Hearing in the Country, that they might clear their innocent Undertakings, and make their just Defence. Could they not clear their Undertakings in Print? It must be then because their undertakings were not Innocent. Could they only offend others in Print, and not defend themselves? Or could they imagine any hearing in the Country (how publick so ever) could be so publick as from the Press, where they began? How shallow and silly their pretences are! But it may be guessed what sort of hearing they intended (if indeed they really intended any) by their proposing it to be before such Friends and Neighbours that are willing (said they) to hear what we have to say. A partial Auditory they designed, it seems not such as would indifferently hear what both sides had to say, but such as would hear what THEY had to say. They desired also to know who were the Approvers of such Books, and whether they are not paid for out of the Publick Stock? Why did they not, at the same time, signify who were the Approvers of their Paper (if any but themselves approved it) and out of what stock it was paid for? Could they not clear their undertakings, and defend themselves without knowing the Approvers of my Book, and how it was paid for? My Name is to my Book in words at length: What then doth it concern them either who approved it, or how it was printed. This shews their Design was, under pretence of clearing themselves (which they know they never can) to pick some fresh Quarrel to wrangle and make a noise about, and so slip off from their own Purgation. Their Agent L. Key says (and that truly) *Truth is strongest:* And had they had, or believed they had, Truth on their side, they knew where to have met me, even where they complained I had met with them; viz. in Print. Which as it is the most publick so was it the most suitable, and indeed the only proper way for them and me to meet, on that Subject, after they had begun in Print. Had they sought me there, and I had not appeared, he might with less untruth have said I declined a Meeting. But being conscious to themselves of their own Guilt, and not thinking it safe to trust their Cause to the deliberate Examination of every judicious Eye, they themselves declined that sort of Meeting which they had given the open Challenge to. For in the first Postscript to their Account from Wickham, p. 4. they say, *Now if we and our Friends be no better esteemed than we have been rendered by some persons, let them come forth in plainness, and if there be no Unity, no Peace to be made with us, LET THEM MAKE THE CAUSE PUBLICK.* Were they such Children, to think that, after they had, by such a daring Provocation, drawn forth something of the Cause in publick, they should slip back into a Corner, for such the most publick Hearing may be called in comparison of the Press) to have the matters, already printed, heard and adjudged by a partial Auditory, of such, perhaps, as were either Patients to J. R. or of Party with them both; such, it may be, as was that Person, who (when C. H. in a publick Meeting, which some Friends had lately with him in this Country, where he and they dwell, was openly charged with an evil Conversation, and proof offered to be made thereof, which he refused to hear, or stand the trial of) said *If ye do prove it, I will not believe it, Before such Hearers it is probable they would be willing to have an Hearing, such as would hear what They have to say, and would not believe Proof against them.* But let them remember, they have in print bid us come forth in plainness, they have in print bid us make the Cause publick; and so far as that has been already done, shall (with Gods help) be as publickly defended.